

REMARKS:

Applicants, their principal representatives in Germany, and the undersigned have carefully reviewed the first Office Action on the merits of March 13, 2009 in the subject U.S. patent application. In response, the Substitute Specification and claims have been amended. It is believed that the claims which are now pending in the subject application are patentable over the prior art cited and relied on, taken either singly or in combination. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, applicant's election of claims 50-73 for examination in the subject application was noted. The third sentence of the Election/Restriction paragraph at page 2 of the Detailed Action is believed to be incorrect. Claims 50-73 are not withdrawn from consideration. They have been selected for prosecution. Claims 74-92 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 74-92 have now been cancelled. Applicants again specifically reserve the right to file one or more divisional patent application directed to those non-elected claims.

Claim 73 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. That claim has been amended and is believed to now recite the identifier space as being configurable, as interpreted by the Examiner. Support for this is believed to be set forth in the Substitute Specification at paragraph 0033.

Claims 50, 58-62, 72 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0117399 to Dittmar in

view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0168150 to Ziv. Claims 53-56 and 66 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, they were indicated as being allowable, if rewritten in independent form and including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 51, 52, 57 and 63-71 were allowed.

The allowance of claims 51, 52, 57 and 63-71 is noted with appreciation. These claims have been carried forward with minor revisions to correct minor errors of form.

Indicated allowable dependent claim 53 has been cancelled and its language has been incorporated in currently amended independent claim 50. It is believed that claim 50, as so amended, is now patentable. Indicated allowable claim 54 has been amended to depend from believed allowable, currently amended claim 50. Claims 55 and 56 depend indirectly from claim 50 and are also now believed to be allowable. Claim 66 has also been amended to depend from believed allowable, currently amended claim 50.

A review of the Substitute Specification, in the course of the preparation of the subject Amendment, noted one minor typographical error. That error has been corrected without the addition of any new matter.

The prior art cited and relied on in the rejections of the claims have been noted. Since claim 50 has been amended to include the language of indicated allowable claim 53, no discussion of the prior art is believed to be required.

SUMMARY:

A minor typographical error has been corrected in the Substitute Specification. Various ones of the claims have been amended to correct minor formal matters. All of the claims now pending in the subject application, are believed to be patentable over the prior art cited and relied on. Allowance of the claims and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Franz CZOTSCHER et al.
Applicants

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant



Douglas R. Hanscom
Reg. No. 26,600

May 19, 2009
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Customer No. 23294
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, Virginia 22202
Phone: (703) 415-1500
Fax: (703) 415-1508
E-mail: mail@jonestullarcooper.com
Attorney Docket: W1.2096 PCT-US